

Interview Summary

Application No.
08/973,021

Applicant(s)
rsen, Mouritsen, Hindersson, Duch, Sorensen, Dal

Examiner
WILLIAM SANDALS

Group Art Unit
1636



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) WILLIAM SANDALS

(3) Doug Price, Esq.

(2) George Elliott

(4) Peter Koefoed, Esq.

Date of Interview Mar 31, 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-18, 20-26, 30, 31, 34, 36-42, 48, 53, and 59-70

Identification of prior art discussed:

Kay et al., Wong et al. and DiSanto et al.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

We discussed the teachings of Kay et al. which lacks a clear nexus for obviousness. We discussed the requirement of the instant invention for a eukaryotic cell for expression. We discussed the importance of the one gene-one cell approach, and that electroporation cannot achieve this limitation. We discussed the distinction of the requirement in Kay et al. for a cell surface component. We discussed the low efficiency of DiSanto et al. due to the limitations of electroporation. We discussed the teachings of Wong et al. where the teachings of Wong et al. do not permit the discovery of non-natural products, such as the short sequences of the instant invention.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.